



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,725	05/12/2005	Hidegori Abe	10525.0006	7083
22852	7590	06/16/2009	EXAMINER	
		FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413	JARRELL, NOBLE E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/534,725	ABE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NOBLE JARRELL	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4,7-9,11-20,22,24,26 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,4,7-9,11,12,14-20,22,24,26 and 27 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 13 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 1st and 2nd paragraph has been overcome by the amendment filed 12 March 2009.

2. In the currently amended set of claims, claims 1, 4, 7-9, 11-20, 22, 24, 26, and 27 are pending.

Claims 2-3, 5-6, 10, 21, 23, 25 and 28 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Newly amended claims 1, 4, 7-9, 11, 12, 14-20, 22, 24, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for 5 to 6-membered aromatic heterocyclic rings and groups (1) to (20), and (22) to (23) as substituents for ring A of formula (I), does not reasonably provide enablement for 7-membered heterocyclic aromatic rings. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir., 1988). The court in *Wands* states, "Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation, such as routine screening. However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue', not 'experimentation'" (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to make or use the invention. "Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations" (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Among these factors are: (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the breadth of the claims; (3) the state of the prior art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the relative skill of those in the art; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

Consideration of the relevant factors sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case for lack of enablement is set forth herein below:

(1) The nature of the invention and (2) the breadth of the claims:

The claims are drawn to compounds (and compositions comprising the same) composed of a carboxamide group directly bonded to a phenylene ring modified with a C₁₋₆-alkylene-NR¹R² group. Thus, the claims taken together with the specification imply that compounds (and compositions comprising the same) where ring A is substituted with a 7-membered heterocyclic aromatic ring can be prepared.

(3) The state of the prior art and (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art:

March (*Advanced Organic Chemistry, 1992*, pages 45-48 and 58-59) that 7-membered heterocyclic aromatic rings do not exist. March teaches that oxonin, a 9-membered ring with a ten electron system is aromatic. However, March does not teach any 7-membered heterocyclic aromatic ring systems.

(5) The relative skill of those in the art:

Those of relative skill in the art are those with level of skill of the authors of the references cited to support the examiner's position. The relative skill of those in this art is MD's, PhD's, or those with advanced degrees and the requisite experience in preparation of compounds where ring A is substituted with a 7-membered heterocyclic aromatic ring.

(6) The amount of direction or guidance presented and (7) the presence or absence of working examples:

The specification has provided guidance for 5 to 6-membered rings as substituents for ring A and groups (1) to (20), and (22) to (23) as substituents for ring A of formula (1).

However, the specification does not provide guidance for preparation of compounds where ring A is substituted with a 7-membered heterocyclic aromatic ring system.

Art Unit: 1624

(8) *The quantity of experimentation necessary:*

Considering the state of the art as discussed by the references above, particularly with regards to claims 1, 4, 7-9, 11, 12, 14-20, 22, 24, 26, and 27 and the high unpredictability in the art as evidenced therein, and the lack of guidance provided in the specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would be burdened with undue experimentation to practice the invention commensurate in the scope of the claims.

5. Claim 22 and newly amended claims 19, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the *In vitro* binding of compounds of the instant application to ^{125}I -somatostatin, does not reasonably provide enablement for treatment of any disorder linked to inhibition of somatostatin. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir., 1988). The court in Wands states, “Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation, such as routine screening. However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is ‘undue’, not ‘experimentation’” (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to make or use the invention. “Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations” (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Among these factors are: (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the breadth of the claims; (3) the state of the prior art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the relative skill of those in the art; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

Consideration of the relevant factors sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case for lack of enablement is set forth herein below:

(1) *The nature of the invention and (2) the breadth of the claims:*

The claims are drawn to methods using compounds composed of a piperidine/piperazine-bond/spacer-N-CH(C-indolyl)-C(O)-N-phenylene-alkyl-N core

structure as agents for the treatment of diabetes, diabetes complications, or obesity, as well as the inhibition of somatostatin receptor binding.

(3) *The state of the prior art and (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art:*

Boehm et al. (*Best Practices in Clinical Gastroenterology*, **2002**, 16(3), pages 493-509) teach that before somatostatin and its analogues can be used as a therapeutic target in obesity and diabetes, the understanding of the pathophysiology and diabetes has to be changed. The relative merits of SMS treatment in obesity and diabetic complications remains to be assessed in large multicentre investigation. This reference shows that future research is needed to determine if somatostatin is a reliable target for therapy of obesity, diabetes, or diabetic complications (page 505).

Freeman (*New England Journal of Medicine*, **2008**, 356(8), 615-624) teaches that somatostatin as a way of treating orthostatic hypertension has led to inconsistent results (page 621, column 2, paragraph 6).

(5) *The relative skill of those in the art:*

Those of relative skill in the art are those with level of skill of the authors of the references cited to support the examiner's position. The relative skill of those in this art is MD's, PhD's, or those with advanced degrees and the requisite experience in treatment of disorders linked to the inhibition of somatostatin receptors.

(6) *The amount of direction or guidance presented and (7) the presence or absence of working examples:*

The specification has provided guidance for *in vitro* inhibition of ^{125}I -Somatostatin. However, the specification does not provide guidance for disorders linked to somatostatin inhibition.

(8) The quantity of experimentation necessary:

Considering the state of the art as discussed by the references above, particularly with regards to claims 22, 24, and 26 and the high unpredictability in the art as evidenced therein, and the lack of guidance provided in the specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would be burdened with undue experimentation to practice the invention commensurate in the scope of the claims.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Newly amended claims 19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. What disorder is “Doan syndrome?” This disorder is referred to in the specification as well (page 69, line 20).

Double Patenting

8. Claims 15-20 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 14. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k). Claims 15-20 are each pharmaceutical composition claims, and in these claims the intended use of the composition does not carry any patentable weight. Thus, these claims are considered duplicative of claim 14.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the

mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Claim 13 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. Claim 13 appears free of the prior art because Escerich et al. (*Biopolymers*, **2001**, 56(2), 55-76, cited in IDS) teach a compound with Registry number 404391-75-9. In this structure, variable A is a (Z)-1*H*-benzo[e][1,4]diazepin-2(3*H*)-one ring. This ring is not anticipatory or obvious over a phenylene ring.
Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NOBLE JARRELL whose telephone number is (571)272-9077. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 A.M - 6:00 P.M. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. James O. Wilson can be reached on (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Noble Jarrell/
Examiner, Art Unit 1624

**/James O. Wilson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1624**